



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Examiner indicated that the arguments directed to the unexpected improvement when using a first and second magnetic layer having substantially the same urethane group concentration appeared to only be supported for when the magnetic layers were deposited using a Wet-on-Wet process (see Applicants' specification, Paragraph No. 0028 and examples). Applicants' representative agreed to amend the claims to include the positive recitation that the layers were deposited via a Wet-on-Wet process and to cancel the withdrawn claims (claims 5 - 7).